

A fixed time step approach for multi-body dynamics with contact and friction

Mihai Anitescu

Mathematics and Computer Science Division,
Building 221, Argonne National Laboratory,
9700 South Cass Avenue,
Argonne, IL 60439, U.S.A
email: anitescu@mcs.anl.gov

Abstract—We present a fixed time-step algorithm for the simulation of multi-rigid-body dynamics with joints, contact, collision and friction. The method solves a linear complementarity problem (LCP) at each step. We show that the algorithm can be obtained as the stiff limit of fixed time step schemes applied to regularized contact models. We do not perform collision detection. Instead, a noninterpenetration constraint is replaced by its linearization, which, together with a judicious choice of the active constraints guarantees geometrical constraint stabilization without the need to perform a reduction of the time step to detect new collision or stick-slip transition events. Partially elastic collisions are accommodated by a suitable modification of the free term of the LCP.

The submitted manuscript has been created by the University of Chicago as Operator of Argonne National Laboratory ("Argonne") under Contract No. W-31-109-ENG-38 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The U.S. Government retains for itself, and others acting on its behalf, a paid-up, nonexclusive, irrevocable worldwide license in said article to reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, by or on behalf of the Government.

I. INTRODUCTION

Simulating the dynamics of a system with several rigid bodies and with joint, contact (noninterpenetration), and friction constraints is an important part of virtual reality and robotics simulations.

If the simulation has only joint constraints, then the problem is a differential algebraic equation (DAE) [11], [6], which is a widely studied and used computational paradigm. However, the nonsmooth nature of the noninterpenetration and friction constraints requires the use of specialized techniques. By and large there are two ways to approach this nonsmoothness: regularization approaches and hard constraint (complementarity) approaches.

The regularization approach [9], [20], [15] consists of smoothing the nonsmoothness in the description of noninterpenetration and frictional constraints and creating a DAE for which there exist substantial analytical and software tools, which is an important advantage. Sometimes the smoothing is based on some physical interpretation as is the case when using a nonlinear spring and damper model as a replacement for the noninterpenetration constraint [15]. The immediate disadvantage of the regularization approach is that the resulting DAE can be quite stiff.

The complementarity approach has been used in either an acceleration-force setup [10], [7], [13], or a velocity-impulse time-stepping approach [22], [21], [4], [5]. The latter has the advantage that it always produces a solution that satisfies the constraint simulations and avoids the Coulomb friction model inconsistencies that are apparent in the acceleration-force approach. It is worth mentioning that, when the value of the time step is set to 0, the LCP of the velocity-impulse approach is the same as the one used in the compression phase of multiple collision resolution [14]. The advantage of the complementarity approach is that there are no additional parameters to tune and there are no model stability issues. This gain comes at the cost of a more difficult subproblem to solve, that is, a potentially nonconvex LCP.

All of the hard constraint approaches mentioned above are based on collision detection. A decision, based on geometrical computations, is made of what are the pairs of bodies in contact and which features are active at the current time. Then the LCP is set up to compute the new acceleration or the new velocity, and these are used to compute the future value of the position for the intended time step. If a new collision occurs within the time step, the simulation is backtracked to the first collision and the simulation is restarted after applying a collision resolution technique [14], [4].

Although this approach leads to a stable simulation, the amount of computation needed per unit of target time step is impossible to predict, due to the fact that there is no conceptual upper bound on the number of collisions that can occur per unit of time. One extreme example is the one of a rigid ball bouncing on a flat, rigid, surface with a restitution coefficient strictly between 0 and 1, which sustains an infinite number of collisions in a finite amount of time. Of course, this situation can be accommodated by turning the restitution coefficient to 0 if the normal velocity is below a certain threshold, but our example serves to show that there is no upper bound on the number of collisions, and, therefore, on the number of backtracking steps. In the hard constraint approach the matters are made worse by the fact that the LCP subproblems are expensive compared to one step of an explicit method applied to a regularization formulation. The fact that bouncing substantially worsens the performance of hard constraint approaches has been noted before in comparison with impulse-

based simulation [18].

It should also be noted that regularization approaches are not immune to increased computation in the case of locally high density of events, even though the effect is not explicit. In this case, proximity of an event such as collision is manifested by a sudden increase in the penalty term that leads to terminal instability unless the time-step is reduced dramatically or the system is treated implicitly. In the latter case, reduction of the time-step may also occur since the existence of a solution to the nonlinear equation defining the integration method is guaranteed only for sufficiently small time-steps [16].

The fact that the amount of computation per unit of time-step may be locally unpredictable creates an important obstacle for applications that are intended to run, eventually, in an interactive fashion. It is therefore useful to investigate whether it is possible to define an approach where, once the time-step is fixed, the amount of computation necessary to advance the simulation for that one time-step is upper bounded, while maintaining the stability of the system.

A stable fixed time step approach can be realized in two ways, based on the approaches presented above. One can either integrate the equations that result from the penalty method implicitly, or one can use a time-stepping approach. We will show that, in this context, the two approaches lead to essentially the same subproblems to be solved at every step, and we will therefore concentrate on the complementarity approach. We show how partially elastic collisions as well as contact, friction and joint constraints can be accommodated by this approach. We have found that, for this method, constraint stabilization can be achieved at no additional cost, similarly as in [2].

In the following we will restrict ourselves to first-order integration methods. This is justifiable since, if we do not plan to perform collision detection, the method cannot exceed order 1 anyway [16].

II. EXTREMAL ANALYSIS OF A PENALTY MODEL

Consider a multi-rigid-body system whose state is quantified by the position vector q and the velocity vector v . The external and inertial forces are denoted by $k(t, q, v)$. We assume that the system has a constant, positive-definite mass matrix M . This assumption is not essential, but it simplifies our notation. Such a mass matrix can be obtained in the Newton Euler body coordinates.

A noninterpenetration constraints is represented by means of the signed distance between two bodies functions, $\Phi(q)$ [12]. The noninterpenetration constraint becomes $\Phi(q) \geq 0$. The mapping $\Phi(q)$ is generally not differentiable everywhere even for simple shapes [2]. For smooth and strictly convex bodies, the mapping $\Phi(q)$ is differentiable in a neighborhood of the feasible set $\{q | \Phi(q) \geq 0\}$. To simplify the discussions we assume that $\Phi(q)$ is differentiable at every point where it is evaluated and we defer to future work the case when $\Phi(q)$ is nonsmooth that appears for both nonconvex smooth-shaped and nonsmooth-shaped bodies.

We consider that the system is subject to m noninterpenetration constraints. The feasible set for the entire system is represented by

$$\Phi^{(j)}(q) \geq 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (2.1)$$

To enforce these constraints we use a penalty method [15] which allows the noninterpenetration constraints to be violated but creates a reaction force that prevents more severe interpenetration. For one noninterpenetration constraint j , the modulus of the reaction force is

$$\theta^{(j)}(q) = \gamma^{(j)} \left(\Phi_-^{(j)}(q) \right)^b, \quad (2.2)$$

where $b > 1$ is some appropriate exponent and $\gamma^{(j)} > 0$ is the penalty parameter. Here the quantity $\Phi_-^{(j)}(q)$ represents the negative part, that is, the constraint violation, of $\Phi^{(j)}(q)$. Its algebraic expression is

$$\Phi_-^{(j)}(q) = \frac{-\Phi^{(j)}(q) + |\Phi^{(j)}(q)|}{2}.$$

We can add to (2.2) a damping term whose effect is to produce dissipation when a collision occurs. For the present development we restrict our model to the elastic-type force from (2.2). By using Hertzian contact theory, it is determined that, in 3 dimensions, the appropriate exponent is $b = \frac{3}{2}$ [15]. Note that, when $b > 1$, we have that the function $\theta^{(j)}(q)$ is continuously differentiable.

For the total reaction force from the noninterpenetration constraints to be of the potential type, its direction must be $\nabla_q(\Phi^{(j)})(q)$. With these choices and the use of Newton's law, the dynamics of the system becomes.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dq}{dt} &= v, \\ M \frac{dv}{dt} &= k(t, q, v) + \sum_{j=1}^m \theta^{(j)}(q) \nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}(q). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

We now look for numerical schemes for the system (2.3). The concern is that the stiffness that appears through the force modulus $\theta^{(j)}(q)$ could lead to numerical instability. To alleviate this concern, we consider two stiffness accommodating approaches: (1) $\theta^{(j)}(q)$ is treated implicitly and (2) $\theta^{(j)}(q)$ is treated linearly implicitly. In the following, we consider h_l , $t^{(l)}$, $q^{(l)}$ and $v^{(l)}$ to be the current time step, time, position and, respectively, velocity. We have that $t^{(l+1)} - t^{(l)} = h_l$. For generality of the setup we allow h_l to vary but our method works just as well for a fixed time step.

A. The implicit approach

We obtain the following time-stepping scheme

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(l+1)} &= q^{(l)} + h_l v^{(l+1)}, \\ M \frac{v^{(l+1)} - v^{(l)}}{h_l} &= k(t^{(l)}, q^{(l)}, v^{(l)}) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^m \theta^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Consider the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_v \psi(v, \Gamma) &= \frac{1}{2} v^T M v - v^T (M v^l + h_l k(t^l, q^l, v^l)) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{b+1} \gamma^{(j)} \left(\Phi_-^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + h_l v) \right)^{b+1} \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

where $\Gamma = (\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}, \dots, \gamma^{(m)})$.

Then it can immediately be seen that any local solution v^* of the optimization problem (2.5) is a solution $v^{(l+1)}$ of (2.4). In effect, the discretized version of Newton's law in (2.4) are precisely the optimality conditions for the optimization problem (2.5). This property is related to the one of variational integrators [17].

We are interested in the situation where $\gamma^{(j)}$ is so large that it results in stiffness that is much more severe than the intended time step could accommodate. So we wish to determine what happens if we let $\gamma^{(j)} \rightarrow \infty$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. We denote by v_n the solution (and, in case of multiplicity, the global solution) of (2.5) when $\Gamma_n = \Gamma = (\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}, \dots, \gamma^{(m)}) = (n, n, \dots, n)$. One solution must exist because the objective function is bounded below due to the existence of the quadratic term and to the nonnegativity of the penalty term.

We assume that the set defined by the constraints (2.1) is feasible, that is, that there exists some q^* such that $\Phi^{(j)}(q^*) \geq 0$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. This implies that $\Phi_-^{(j)}(q^*) = 0$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. In this case it is immediate that, since v_n is the optimal solution of (2.5), that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} v_n^T M v_n - v_n^T (M v^l + h_l k(t^l, q^l, v^l)) \\ & \leq \psi(v_n, \Gamma_n) \leq \psi\left(\frac{q^* - q^l}{h_l}, \Gamma_n\right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore the sequence v_n is upper bounded uniformly with n since, due to the fact that q^* is feasible, the last term in the preceding sequence of inequalities does not depend on Γ_n . Therefore v_n admits a limit point v_* .

Another consequence is that the term $\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{b+1} n \left(\Phi_-^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + h_l v_n) \right)^{b+1}$ is upper bounded uniformly with respect to n . Taking the limit we obtain that $\Phi_-^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + h_l v_*) = 0$, that is that the point $q^{(l)} + h_l v_*$ is feasible.

Finally, if the set of vectors $\{\nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}\}$ are linearly independent, then from (2.3) it can be seen that $\theta^{(j)}(q^l + h_l v_n)$ is also uniformly bounded and we can assume, after eventually restricting to a subsequence, that $\theta^{(j)}(q^l + h_l v_n) \rightarrow c^{(j)} \geq 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Since we have that $(a_-)^b a = -(a_-)^{(b+1)}$ for any real number a , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta^{(j)}(q^l + h_l v_n) \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + h_l v_n) \\ & = -\theta^{(j)}(q^l + h_l v_n) \Phi_-^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + h_l v_n). \end{aligned}$$

From our preceding results, this implies that $c^{(j)} \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + h_l v_*) = 0$.

After we replace all these limit relations in (2.3) and we associate $v^{(l+1)}$ to v_* , and $c^{(j), (l+1)}$ to $c^{(j)}$, we obtain the following nonlinear complementarity based time-stepping

scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(l+1)} &= q^{(l)} + h_l v^{(l+1)}. \\ M \frac{v^{(l+1)} - v^{(l)}}{h_l} &= k(t^{(l)}, q^{(l)}, v^{(l)}) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m c^{(j), (l+1)} \nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \\ 0 &\leq c^{(j), (l+1)} \\ 0 &\leq \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \\ 0 &= c^{(j), (l+1)} \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

which is precisely the time-stepping scheme from [22], for the frictionless case.

B. The linearly implicit approach

In this case, the stiffness in $\theta^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)})$ is accommodated by linearization. To obtain meaningful results it is useful to write $\theta^{(j)}(q)$ in the form $\theta^{(j)}(q) = \gamma^{(j)} \epsilon(\Phi^{(j)}(q)) |\Phi^{(j)}(q)|^b$, where

$$\epsilon(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \leq 0 \\ 0 & x > 0 \end{cases}$$

We approximate $\theta^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)})$ by linearizing $\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)})$ at the point $q^{(l)}$, and we use that $q^{(l+1)} = q^{(l)} + h_l v^{(l+1)}$, as well as the approximation

$$\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \approx \hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)}) = \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)},$$

to obtain that

$$\theta^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \approx \hat{\theta}^{(j)}(v^{(l+1)}) = \gamma^{(j)} \epsilon\left(\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)})\right) \left|\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)})\right|^b$$

The numerical scheme becomes,

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(l+1)} &= q^{(l)} + h_l v^{(l+1)}. \\ M \frac{v^{(l+1)} - v^{(l)}}{h_l} &= k(t^{(l)}, q^{(l)}, v^{(l)}) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\theta}^{(j)}(v^{(l+1)}) \nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Note that the gradient of Φ is evaluated at $q^{(l)}$, since its linearization would result in an $O(h_l)$ term that disappears in the limit.

If $b > 1$, we use that $\frac{d}{dt}|t|^a = \text{sgn}(t)|t|^{a-1}$ which is true whenever $a > 1$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{v^{l+1}} \frac{1}{b+1} \epsilon\left(\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)})\right) \left|\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)})\right|^{b+1} \\ & = -\epsilon\left(\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)})\right) \left|\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v^{(l+1)})\right|^b \end{aligned}$$

We therefore get that $v^{(l+1)}$ is a solution of the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_v \psi(v, \Gamma) &= \frac{1}{2} v^T M v - v^T (M v^l + h_l k(t^l, q^l, v^l)) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{b+1} \gamma^{(j)} \epsilon\left(\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v)\right) \left|\hat{\Phi}^{(j), (l)}(v)\right|^{b+1} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

By using the same techniques as in the fully implicit case, we obtain the following LCP-based time-stepping scheme in the stiff limit of $\gamma^{(j)} \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned} q^{(l+1)} &= q^{(l)} + h_l v^{(l+1)}. \\ M \frac{v^{(l+1)} - v^{(l)}}{h_l} &= k(t^{(l)}, q^{(l)}, v^{(l)}) \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^m c^{(j), (l+1)} \nabla_q \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) \\ 0 &\leq c^{(j), (l+1)} \\ 0 &\leq \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla \Phi(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)} \\ 0 &= c^{(j), (l+1)} (\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla \Phi(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

This is precisely the time-stepping scheme from [2] when joint and frictional constraints are not present. It has been shown that this scheme is not only stable if the ratio between consecutive time-steps is bounded below (the velocity stays bounded uniformly as the time-step goes to 0), but also that it achieves constraint stabilization without the need to solve a problem where feasibility is enforced exactly at $q^{(l+1)}$ in a nonlinear fashion. A similar constraint stabilization result is achieved if we replace the constraint $0 \leq \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla \Phi(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)}$ by $0 \leq \gamma \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla \Phi(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)}$, where γ is a parameter in $(0, 1]$ [1].

C. Discussion

We have obtained that, in the very stiff limit of the penalty method (when the parameters $\gamma^{(j)}$ approach ∞ , by rapport to the size of the time-step), we recover complementarity-based time-stepping schemes.

It should be pointed out that, for many simulation schemes, if the penalty parameter is appropriately chosen and the velocities are not exceedingly large, then one can use an explicit integration method that produces quite accurate results [15], especially when there is only one contact. But if one desires to create a general purpose simulation environment that is computationally efficient, then a stable scheme is required for a large variety of examples. It is difficult to find the appropriate penalty parameter, especially in a multicontact regime, where it is conceivable that the penalty parameters should be chosen differently for each contact.

In the case that, in order to accommodate a wide range of applications for a fixed target time-step, one goes to an implicit approach of some kind, then choosing a large penalty parameter in order to prevent interpenetration for a large class of examples results essentially in an complementarity-based time-stepping scheme, as shown in this section. For this reason, in the rest of the paper we work with an LCP-based approach.

III. ACCOMMODATING THE CAVEATS OF A FIXED TIME-STEP MODEL

As it is to be expected, although a fixed time-step approach has the obvious advantage of solving a predictable number of subproblems per step, it also presents some unwanted side-effects. In this section we describe them and discuss possible ways to avoid them.

When describing some of the issues we will discuss about collisions. Since we do not do collision detection, we should specify what we consider a collision. We say that a collision occurs if both $\Phi(q^{(l)}) > 0$ and $\Phi(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla \phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)} > 0$ but $c^{(j),(l+1)} > 0$ (the multiplier for the normal force at the next step).

A. A larger number of constraints

Either the nonlinear (2.6) or the linearized formulation (2.9) have the problem that all constraints need to be considered. If we do not intend to backtrack if a constraint is violated then all constraints that could become active need to be included on

the list of constraints to be enforced. A simple and provably correct strategy, at least in the limit of sufficiently small time step is to define the active set as

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ j \mid \Phi^{(j)}(q) \leq \epsilon \right\}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is a fixed parameter. In our numerical experiments, we used a parameter ϵ that was dependent on the product between the norm of the velocity and the size of the time-step and we did not encounter any difficulties.

B. All collisions that occur during one time-step are simultaneous

This effect is best observed if the mappings $\Phi^{(j)}(q)$ are linear. If $\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) > 0$ but $c_n^{(j),(l+1)} > 0$ then, from (2.9) $\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l+1)}) = 0$, but $\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)} + t(q^{(l+1)} - q^{(l)})) > 0$ for any $t < 1$. So the distance can switch from positive to 0 only at the end of one interval. In some sense, this is one feature that makes the method work: by forcing all collisions occurring during one time-step to be simultaneous, we avoid having to treat them sequentially, which could require an uncontrollable amount of computational effort.

If collisions are isolated in time (which is not the case with the bouncing ball example at the beginning of this paper), then, as the time-step goes to 0, they will eventually be resolved individually so this is not so much of an issue. But for many bodies, it is unlikely that the user is willing to take a sufficiently small time step that will isolate the collisions, since this may lead to a large amount of computation, especially if each step involves solving an LCP.

It should also be mentioned that, in light of the extremal analysis of the penalty model, this is unavoidable for any method that attempts to simulate with a fixed time step. In our (subjective) experience, in animation applications this effect is invisible for time steps of 0.05 and below.

C. Dissipation of Energy

If we use the scheme (2.9) to simulate a ball falling on a table, we can show (as we later show in an example) that the ball will stick to the table, even though we started with a non-dissipative penalty model to justify (2.9). Therefore (2.9) can accommodate only plastic collisions. This is to be expected, because backward Euler type schemes are dissipative. The use a symplectic method like implicit midpoint on the penalty approach followed by taking the parameters $\gamma^{(j)}$ to ∞ does not completely remedy this problem. We will address this issue by using an explicit energy restitution model.

D. The impact velocity depends non-trivially on the time-step

We will prove by an example this effect that is, by far, the most subtle of a fixed time-step approach. We assume that there is a ball that moves horizontally without friction, starting at $x = 0$ with velocity 1 and it encounters a wall at $x = 1$. We assume that there is no gravity so, in effect, this is one dimensional motion. We assume that the collision response mechanism is of the Newton type [14]: a portion e of the




Fig. 1. Velocity after collision for the fixed time-step uncorrected method.

normal velocity is returned to the system. The exact velocity solution to this problem is clearly

$$\dot{x}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & t \in [0, 1] \\ -e & t \in [1, \infty) \end{cases}.$$

We now assume that we apply the linearized time-stepping scheme (2.9) with constant time step h . We have only one noninterpenetration constraint: $\Phi(x) = 1 - x \geq 0$. Denote by $L = \lceil \frac{1}{h} \rceil - 1$, where by $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ we denote the ceiling function: the smallest integer larger than or equal to the argument of the function. We clearly have that the constraint is inactive and that $\dot{x}^l = 1$ and $x^l = lh$ for $l \leq L$. Since $x^L + h > 1$, we must have a collision at time L . From (2.9) we get that (since a collision must occur)

$$\dot{x}^{L+1} = 1 - c^{(1),L}, \quad 1 - x^L - h\dot{x}^{L+1} = 0.$$

The solution to this problem is $\dot{x}^{L+1} = \frac{1}{h} - \lceil \frac{1}{h} \rceil + 1 \in (0, 1]$ and $c^{(1),L} = -\frac{1}{h} + \lceil \frac{1}{h} \rceil \in [0, 1)$. The velocity solution after impact will be $\dot{x}^l = -e - e\frac{1}{h} + e\lceil \frac{1}{h} \rceil$ for $l \geq L+2$ instead of its exact solution $\dot{x}^{(l)} = -e$. As $h \rightarrow 0$, the error lives anywhere in the range $[0, e)$, being able to be for example $\frac{e}{2}$ for arbitrarily small values of h ! This effect is seen in Figure 1 for $e = 1$.

If the collision is inelastic ($e=0$), then the error after collision is 0, but if the collision is partially elastic, then we may introduce an $O(1)$ error for arbitrarily small values of the time step. Note that the situation does not improve if we use a collision model based on the Poisson hypothesis [14], [4]: that part of the compression impulse is restituted (even if, at time $L+1$, we consider the collision instantaneous instead of embedding it in a time-stepping scheme). Indeed, the Lagrange multiplier $c^{(1),L}$, that enters an impulse restitution model suffers from exactly the same effect.

IV. A VELOCITY RESTITUTION MODEL FOR FIXED TIME-STEP SCHEMES

The simultaneous contact issue is unavoidable for fixed time-step schemes. We will address the last two issues that appear in a fixed time-step scheme by defining an appropriate velocity restitution (Newton) model. Since we cannot use the velocity at the time of the collision to compute the restituted

velocity, due to the lack of convergence effect, we will use the normal velocity computed with the velocity vector at the previous time (for our example, time L), before the collision occurred. In doing so, we may incur an $O(h)$ error which is unavoidable anyway if we do not detect events such as collisions with superior accuracy [16]. If the number of collisions is finite, then these errors disappear in the limit. If a collision occurs at contact (j) , at time $l-1$, then we replace the linearization of the contact constraint from (2.9) by

$$\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)}) + h_l \nabla \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l+1)} + h_l \Lambda^{(j),l} \geq 0$$

where, after computing the modified normal velocity $v_n^{(j),l} = \nabla \Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)})^T v^{(l-1)}$, we define

$$\Lambda^{(j),l} = e^{(j)} \begin{cases} v_n^{(j),l} & v_n^{(j),l} < -TOL \\ 0 & v_n^{(j),l} \geq -TOL. \end{cases} \quad (4.10)$$

Here $e^{(j)}$ is the restitution coefficient at noninterpenetration constraint (j) . For ease of notation, if a collision does not occur, we still use the parameter $\Lambda^{(j),l}$ though we will assign it a 0 value. The parameter TOL is used as a truncation parameter to remove exceedingly small bounces. If we apply this approach to our one body example, we get that the velocity following the collision is $-e$, the exact solution. In the general case (where the velocity before and after the collision are not constant), we get an error of $O(h)$.

The Newton approach has the advantage that, if it is used as a collision resolution technique (where $\Phi^{(j)}(q^{(l)})$ and h_l are removed from the linearization), it is guaranteed to not increase the kinetic energy when the scheme is slightly modified to include the dissipation terms from $v^{(l)}$ [23]. We cannot guarantee a good energy behavior for our scheme (like that the energy will decrease in an isolated system) though we never saw energy increases with this approach in our examples.

A. The time-stepping LCP

Including frictional and joint constraints, and using the same notations as in [4], [3], [2] and, by and large, the same notation as in [22], [21], we obtain that $q^{(l+1)} = q^{(l)} + h_l v^{(l+1)}$ and that $v^{(l+1)}$ is the solution of the following linear complementarity problem, where we use the notation $Q^{(l)} = Mv^{(l)} + h_l k(t^{(l)}, q^{(l)}, v^{(l)})$

$$\begin{bmatrix} M & -\tilde{\nu} & -\tilde{n} & -\tilde{D} & 0 \\ \tilde{\nu}^T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{n}^T & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \tilde{D}^T & 0 & 0 & 0 & \tilde{E} \\ 0 & 0 & \tilde{\mu} & -\tilde{E}^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} v^{(l+1)} \\ c_\nu \\ c_n \\ \tilde{\beta} \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -Q^{(l)} \\ \tilde{\gamma} \\ \Delta + \Lambda \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \\ \zeta \end{bmatrix} \quad (4.11)$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} c_n \\ \tilde{\beta} \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix}^T \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \\ \zeta \end{bmatrix} = 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} c_n \\ \tilde{\beta} \\ \lambda \end{bmatrix} \geq 0, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\rho}{\sigma} \\ \zeta \end{bmatrix} \geq 0. \quad (4.12)$$

Here $\tilde{\nu} = [\nu^{(1)}, \nu^{(2)}, \dots, \nu^{(m)}]$ are the gradients of the joint constraints, $c_\nu = [c_\nu^{(1)}, c_\nu^{(2)}, \dots, c_\nu^{(m)}]^T$ are the multipliers of the joint constraints, $\tilde{n} = [n^{(j_1)}, n^{(j_1)}, \dots, n^{(j_s)}]$ are the gradients of the active noninterpenetration constraints,

$c_n = [c_n^{(j_1)}, c_n^{(j_2)}, \dots, c_n^{(j_s)}]^T$ are the multipliers (normal impulses) corresponding to the interpenetration constraints, $\tilde{\beta} = [\beta^{(j_1)T}, \beta^{(j_2)T}, \dots, \beta^{(j_s)T}]^T$ is the aggregate of vectors of tangential impulses, $\tilde{D} = [D^{(j_1)}, D^{(j_2)}, \dots, D^{(j_s)}]$, the tangent vectors corresponding to a discretization of the friction cone, $\lambda = [\lambda^{(j_1)}, \lambda^{(j_2)}, \dots, \lambda^{(j_s)}]^T$ are the multipliers of the conical constraint, $\tilde{\mu} = \text{diag}(\mu^{(j_1)}, \mu^{(j_2)}, \dots, \mu^{(j_s)})^T$ is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal is made of the Coulomb friction coefficients $\Upsilon = \frac{1}{h_l} (\Theta^{(1)}, \Theta^{(2)}, \dots, \Theta^{(m)})^T$ where $\Theta^{(i)}$ is the value of the joint constraint i at $q^{(l)}$, $\Delta = \frac{1}{h_l} (\Phi^{(j_1)}, \Phi^{(j_2)}, \dots, \Phi^{(j_s)})^T$, $\Lambda = (\Lambda^{(j_1)}, \Lambda^{(j_2)}, \dots, \Lambda^{(j_s)})^T$ is the vector of restitution factors from (4.10),

$$\tilde{E} = \begin{bmatrix} E^{(j_1)} & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & E^{(j_2)} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & E^{(j_s)} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $E^{(j)}$ is a vector of ones of the same dimension as the number of columns in $D^{(j)}$ and number of elements in $\beta^{(j)}$; are the lumped LCP data. Note that the joint constraints are also enforced by linearization. Here $\mathcal{A} = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_s\}$ are the active contact constraints. The vector inequalities in (4.12) are to be understood componentwise. We use the \sim notation to indicate that the quantity is obtained by properly adjoining blocks that are relevant to the aggregate joint or contact constraints. The problem is called mixed LCP because it contains both equality and complementarity constraints.

We call our model fixed time-step, although h_l is allowed to vary, because the time-step does not need to be reduced to 0 in event of a collision and the collision resolution mechanism is integrated in the time-stepping scheme. In effect, the time step should not be reduced to 0 since it may lead to large velocities due to the fact that Δ and Υ contain an $\frac{1}{h_l}$ factor. If all restitution coefficient are always 0 ($\Lambda = 0$), then the scheme has been proven to be stable and to stabilize constraints.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We have applied this approach to a two-dimensional system whose initial configuration is a cannonball arrangement of 66 disks of radius 3 on a horizontal plank bounded by two slanted walls. The friction coefficient is 0.15, the restitution coefficient is 0.4, the time step is constant 0.05. The simulation was run for 20 seconds, and four frames of the simulation are presented in Figure 4.

From Figure 2 we see that the time it takes to solve the LCP (4.11–4.12) is correlated with the number of active contacts. This is to be expected, since the size of the LCP is proportional to the number of active contacts. We also see that most of the time it took less than 0.5 seconds to solve the LCP on a 1.7 Ghz Pentium IV running Windows 2000. The largest increase in the number of contacts in one timestep was 7. This means that an event-driven method may have taken seven times as many LCPs to solve for the same time step which would have substantially hurt the performance.




Fig. 2. Number of active contacts and LCP computing time per timestep.




Fig. 3. Depth of interpenetration (constraint violation) and total energy.

From Figure 3 we see that neither the constraint violation nor the total energy increase uncontrollably. In effect, the total energy decreases steadily, as should happen in the continuous time limit. In addition we see that the schemes achieves constraint stabilization: constraint violations are rapidly corrected. This effect is proved for 0 restitution coefficient in [2]. The maximum constraint violation is about 8 centimeters, but it should be kept in mind that the body radius is 3 meters.

For successful application of fixed time-steps methods there are several issues that we plan to address in the near future. The method should be extended to nonsmooth shapes which are ubiquitous in applications. Also, a better strategy is needed to predict the future active set which would result in even smaller constraint violation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Michael Ferris and Todd Munson for providing and maintaining PATH [19], [8], a package for solving general linear complementarity problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] Anitescu, M., Miller, A., and Hart, G.D., “Constraint stabilization for time-stepping approaches for rigid multibody dynamics with joints, contact and friction”, Preprint ANL/MCS-P1023-0203, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 2002. Available at <http://www.mcs.anl.gov/~anitescu/PUBLICATIONS/reports.html>.




Fig. 4. Four frames of a two-dimensional cannonball arrangement simulation involving 66 bodies

- [2] Anitescu, M., and Hart, Gary D. "A constraint-stabilized time-stepping scheme for multi-body dynamics with contact and friction", Preprint ANL/MCS-P1002-1002, Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 2002. Available at <http://www.mcs.anl.gov/~anitescu/PUBLICATIONS/reports.html>.
- [3] Anitescu, M., and Potra, F. A., "A time-stepping method for stiff multi-body dynamics with contact and friction", *Int. J. Numerical Methods in Engineering* **55**(7), 753–784, 2002.
- [4] Anitescu, M., and Potra, F. A., "Formulating rigid multi-body-dynamics with contact and friction as solvable linear complementarity problems", *Nonlinear Dynamics* **14**, 231–247, 1997.
- [5] Anitescu, M., Stewart, D., and Potra, F. A., "Time-stepping for three-dimensional rigid body dynamics", *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering* **177**(3–4), 183–197, 1999.
- [6] Ascher, U., and Petzold, L. *Computer Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations and Differential-Algebraic Equations*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1998.
- [7] Baraff, D., "Issues in computing contact forces for non-penetrating rigid bodies", *Algorithmica* **10**, 292–352, 1993.
- [8] Dirkse, S. P., and Ferris, M. C., "The PATH solver: A non-monotone stabilization scheme for mixed complementarity problems", *Optimization Methods and Software* **5**, 123–156, 1995.
- [9] Donald, B. R., and Pai, D. K. "On the motion of compliantly connected rigid bodies in contact: a system for analyzing designs for assembly", *Proceedings of the Conf. on Robotics and Automation*, 1990, pp. 1756–1762.
- [10] Glocker, C., and Pfeiffer, F. "An LCP-approach for multibody systems with planar friction", *Proceedings of the CMIS 92 Contact Mechanics Int. Symposium, Lausanne, Switzerland*, 1992, pp. 13–20.
- [11] Haug, E. J., *Computer Aided Kinematics and Dynamics of Mechanical Systems*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1989.
- [12] Kim, Y. J., Lin, M. C., and Manocha, D., "DEEP: Dual-space expansion for estimating penetration depth between convex polytopes", *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 2002.
- [13] Lo, G., Sudarsky, S., Pang, J.-S., and Trinkle, J., "On dynamic multi-rigid-body contact problems with Coulomb friction", *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik* **77**, 267–279, 1997.
- [14] Glocker, C., and Pfeiffer, F., "Multiple impacts with friction in rigid multi-body systems", *Nonlinear Dynamics* **7**, 471–497, 1995.
- [15] Gonthier, Y., McPhee, J., Piedboeuf, J.C. and Lange, C., "A regularized contact model with asymmetric damping and dwell-time dependent friction", submitted to *Multibody System Dynamics*.
- [16] Hairer, E., and Wanner, G., *Solving ordinary differential equations I – non-stiff problems*, Springer Series in Comput. Mathematics, Vol. 8, Springer-Verlag 1993.
- [17] Marsden, J. E. and West, M., "Discrete mechanics and variational integrators", *Acta Numerica* **10**, 357–514, 2001.
- [18] Mirtich, B., *Impulse-based Dynamic Simulation of Rigid Body Systems*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of California, Berkeley, December, 1996.
- [19] Munson, T. S., *Algorithms and Environments for Complementarity*, Ph.D. thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2000.
- [20] P. Song, P. Kraus, V. Kumar, and P. Dupont, "Analysis of rigid-body dynamic models for simulation of systems with frictional contacts" *J. Applied Mechanics* **68**(1), 118–128, 2001.
- [21] Stewart, D., "Rigid-body dynamics with friction and impact", *SIAM Review* **42** (1), 3–29, 2000.
- [22] Stewart, D. E., and Trinkle, J. C., "An implicit time-stepping scheme for rigid-body dynamics with inelastic collisions and Coulomb friction", *International J. Numerical Methods in Engineering* **39**, 2673–2691, 1996.
- [23] Tzitzouris, J., "Numerical resolution of frictional multi-rigid-body systems via fully implicit time-stepping and nonlinear complementarity", Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Mathematical Sciences, Johns Hopkins University, 2001.